

DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

DIVISION OF ST. CROIX

CONRAD LAURENT,

Plaintiff,

v.

2005-CV-0125

COST-U-LESS V.I., COST-U-LESS, INC.,

Defendant.

**TO: Lee J. Rohn, Esq.
C. Beth Moss, Esq.**

ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL

THIS MATTER is before the Court upon the parties' Joint Stipulation Regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendants Cost-U-Less and Cost-U-Less V.I. For Complete Responses to Rule 26 Disclosures and Discovery (Docket No. 36).

Having reviewed the joint stipulation, the Court makes the following findings and conclusions.

Issue No. 1: Plaintiff has been informed that there are no insurance policies applicable to this matter. Thus, this request is moot.

Interrogatory No. 1: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Laurent v. Cost-U-Less V.I.
2005-CV-0125
Order Regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Compel
Page 2

Interrogatory No. 3: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory No. 4: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory No. 5: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory No. 6: Defendant Cost-U-Less, Inc., has agreed to supplement with the address of Brian Rose.

Interrogatory No. 7: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory No. 8: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory No. 9: Defendant Cost-U-Less, Inc., has agreed to supplement with the last known addresses of the individuals referenced in its response.

Interrogatory No. 10: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Laurent v. Cost-U-Less V.I.
2005-CV-0125
Order Regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Compel
Page 3

Interrogatory No. 11: Defendants have agreed to supplement with the dates each person supervised Plaintiff.

Interrogatory No. 12: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory No. 13: Defendants have agreed to supplement their responses.

Interrogatory No. 15: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory No. 16: Defendants have agreed to supplement their responses.

Interrogatory No. 17: Defendants have agreed to supplement their responses.

Interrogatory No. 18: Defendants have agreed to supplement their responses.

Interrogatory No. 19: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory No. 20: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory No. 21: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants have agreed to supplement with information related to the store manager position after the execution of a confidentiality agreement.

Laurent v. Cost-U-Less V.I.
2005-CV-0125
Order Regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Compel
Page 4

Interrogatory No. 22: The Court sustains Defendants' objections. Defendants need not respond.

Interrogatory No. 23: Defendants' responses are adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Interrogatory Nos. 24 and 25: Defendants have agreed to supplement their responses.

Demand For Production No. 3: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Demand For Production Nos. 4, 13, 16, and 19: Defendants' responses are adequate. Defendants need not supplement.

Demand For Production Nos. 5, 10, 17, and 18: Defendants' response is adequate. Defendants have agreed to supplement with information related to the store manager position after the execution of a confidentiality agreement.

Demand For Production Nos. 20 and 24: Defendants have agreed to supplement their responses.

Based upon the forgoing, it is now hereby **ORDERED:**

Laurent v. Cost-U-Less V.I.
2005-CV-0125
Order Regarding Plaintiff's Motion to Compel
Page 5

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Defendants Cost-U-Less and Cost-U-Less V.I. For Complete Responses to Rule 26 Disclosures and Discovery (Docket No. 36) is **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.**
2. In the event Defendants have not already done so, Defendants shall serve supplemental responses to Interrogatory Nos. 6, 9, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 24, and 25 and Demand For Production Nos. 20 and 24 upon counsel for Plaintiff within ten (10) days from the date of entry of this Order.
3. In the event the parties have not already done so, the parties shall enter into a confidentiality agreement within ten (10) days from the date of entry of this Order.
4. Defendants shall serve supplemental responses to Interrogatory No. 21 and Demand For Production Nos. 5, 10, 17, and 18 upon counsel for Plaintiff within five (5) days from the date of execution of the confidentiality agreement between the parties.

ENTER:

Dated: September 12, 2007

/s/
GEORGE W. CANNON, JR.
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE